



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,086	12/11/2000	Charles Tresser	YOR920000598US1(13893)	3901

7590 04/05/2007
RICHARD L. CATANIA, ESQ
SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY AND PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

WINTER, JOHN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/734,086	Applicant(s) TRESSER ET AL.	
	Examiner John M. Winter	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7,8,11,13 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 5, 7-8, 11, 13, and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 11, 13, and 19-23 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant's arguments entered on January 18, 2007 have been fully considered. The Examiner submits that the amended claims are rejected in view of 35 USC 112.

See following rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "third party emitter issuing..." this limitation is vague and indefinite, it appears that an essential step or process is missing because there is no relation between the feature of "third party emitter" and the other claimed features. This feature appears to impose no limitation upon the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 11, 13, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leighton et al (hereinafter Leighton - US 5,351,302) in view of Mital (US 5,903,652), and Orrin et al (hereinafter Orrin - US 2002/0128940).

Claims 1, 7 and 13, Leighton substantially discloses the limitations of current application such as: creating digitally secure document using cryptography, concatenation of data strings, digital signature, etc [see the entire document particularly, Abstract; C1 L1 to C2 L16], creating titles for personal and real property, the title including, and (ii) a digital signature of the owner [C1 L35-L68], the owner transferring ownership of the financial instrument to another person, the owner, using a public signature schema of the owner, signing the title using a public

Art Unit: 3621

signature scheme of the owner and appending to the title a public part of a signature scheme of said otherperson [C2 L51-L68].

Leighton does not explicitly disclose second party transferee and appending a message to the title, said message including a public part of a signature scheme, and a third party emitter issuing to the owner a title for a financial instrument and a message describing the title and how to contact the emitter.

However, Mital discloses a third party emitter issuing to the owner a title for a financial instrument and a message describing the title and how to contact the emitter [C2 L23-L62; C22 L24 to C23 L20; C27 L17-L53 - see distribute affidavit] to prepare a secure authenticated digital document with digital signature to be transmitted over the internet. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Leighton and include a third party emitter issuing to the owner a title for a financial instrument and a message

describing the title and how to contact the emitter, as disclosed by Mital, to prepare a authenticated digital document for sending over the Internet.

Leighton discloses transferring ownership to other person or another person but failed to explicitly disclose second party transferee and appending a message to the title, said message including a public part of a signature scheme.

Orrin discloses second party transferee (assignee) and appending a message to the title, said message including a public part [paragraphs 04, 15, 30 - see digital signature affixed signature and time-stamp also endorsement] to electronically represent a legal binding document showing the current ownership (assignor) and transfer of the ownership to next owner (assignee) and reduce reliance on paper documents and present the document in electronic format. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Leighton and Mital and include appending a message to the title, said message including a public part, as discloses by Orrin, to form a legally binding digital document and messages such as time-stamp with digital signature either in or out of presence of an official such as: notary, attorney, etc, to be transmitted electronically over the non-secure public communication such as Internet.

As per claims 2, 8, 20

Leighton discloses wherein the transferring step includes the step of the emitter appending to the title a number indicating the number of successive owners of the title (ownership history) [C5 L13-L44].

As per claims 5, & 11

Leighton discloses wherein, the creating step includes the step of using a secure cryptographic generator to create the title [C1 L35-L45; C3 L31 to C4 L14].

As per claim 19,

Leighton discloses said signature scheme includes a private key and a public key; and the step of the owner signing the title includes the step of the owner using the public key of the signature scheme to encrypt the owner's signatures in the title [C1 L54 to C2 L16].

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 20,

Leighton discloses appending to the title a number indicating the number of successive owners of the title; and said other person using said private key of the signature scheme to decrypt the owner's signatures and said number [C1 L54 to C2 L16; C2 L28-68; C4 L26-L68].

As per claims 21 and 23-24,

Lighthouse discloses public/private key and digital signature, digital title, string of information, the issuing step includes the step of making a serial number and a description of the title publicly available as soon as the title is created [C4 L3-L55]. Lighthouse does not explicitly disclose the digital signature of the emitter includes a public key of a public/private key pair of the emitter, the transferring step includes the steps of, after the public part of the signature scheme of said other person is appended to the title, communicating to the emitter said public part of the signature scheme of said other person, the emitter keeping said public part of the signature scheme of said other person and making said public part of the signature scheme of said other person available to potential future buyers, the emitter re-signing the title, and sending the re-signed title to said other person, and sending to the emitter a number N indicating the number of successive owners of the title, and the emitter re-signing the title, and sending the re-signed title to said other person, and a fourth party (another person) potential buyer asking the emitter to freeze the possibility of selling the title to anyone other than fourth party (another person) for a period of time, and a fourth party potential buyer using the emitter to prevent the sale of the title to anyone other than said fourth party for defined period of time. the emitter posting that there is a new owner of the title and describing the public part of the signature scheme of said other person; and However, a titles such as car title, mortgage title, etc is will known where the seller signs the title to transfer an ownership and this transfer of the title can be down by mail or faxed (it fax is acceptable as a legitimate document) where the seller signs the title and mails (faxes) it to the buyer (the car can be sold again and the new owner transfers the title to a new owner), and similar sending to the emitter a number N indicating the number of successive owners of the title (new owner new line). Further buyer's down payment (layaway) are will known to ask the seller to keep/hold the item/property for the buyer for period of time (a fourth party potential buyer asking the emitter to freeze the possibility of selling the title to anyone other than said fourth party for a period of time and a fourth party potential buyer using the emitter to prevent the sale of the title to anyone other than said fourth party for defined period of time) and the following limitations are known: the emitter re-signing the title, and sending the re\signed title to said other person (same like original or first a new owner and current owner/seller), and the emitter posting that there is a new owner of the title and describing the public part of the signature scheme of said other person.

Mital discloses the digital signature of the emitter includes a public key of a public/private key pair of the emitter, the issuing step includes the step of making a serial number and a description of the title publicly available as soon as the title is created [C2 L17-L62; C4 L56-L61; C18 L11 to C19 L50];

the transferring step includes the steps of, after the public part of the signature scheme of said other person is appended to the title, communicating to the emitter said public part of the signature scheme of said other person [C8 L15-L18],

Art Unit: 3621

the emitter keeping said public part of the signature scheme of said other person and making said public part of the signature scheme of said other person available to potential future buyers [C2 L40-L62] to provide automatic transfer of secure document using encryptions. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Leighton and Orrin and, further include encrypted legal document (affidavit), as disclosed by Mital and provide an electronic verifiable legal document with digital signature to be transmitted over the internet.

As per Claim 21,

Lighthouse discloses sharing the signing key between the set of servers, wherein each of the servers has one of said partial keys [C2 L51-L68 - public key is know to others and digital signal has part of the private key]. Lighthouse or Orrin does not explicitly the emitter is comprised of a set S of geographically distributed servers; and the issuing step includes the steps of using a signing key to make the digital signature of the emitter, said signing key including a plurality of partial keys, at least some of the servers signing the title using a distributed protocol and using the partial keys of the servers, considering the title signed by the emitter only if a defined subset of the S servers sign the title, using specified hardware to issue the title, and using the specified hardware to print lists of title numbers and descriptions of the public part of the signature scheme used by the emitter. However, Mital discloses the emitter is comprised of a set S of geographically distributed servers; and the issuing step includes the steps of using a signing key to make the digital signature of the emitter, said signing key including a plurality of partial keys [C2 L17-L62; C9 L19-L55], at least some of the servers signing the title using a distributed protocol (DES encryption) and using the partial keys (portion of key) of the servers [C2 L17-L62], considering the title signed by the emitter only if a defined subset of the S servers sign the title (see merchant computer) [C27 L17-L62; C28 L], using specified hardware to issue the title, and using the specified hardware to print lists of title numbers and descriptions of the public part of the signature scheme used by the emitter (see transmitting the document such as bill to customer where he/she can print) [C15 L15-L18] to establish a secure distributed protocol to allow the distribution of the secure digital document over the internet. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures of Leighton, Orrin and Mital, to establish secure communication protocols and monitors secured transactions.

Claim 3-4, 9-10 & 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leighton, Orrin and Mital as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 above, and further in view of Muftic (US 5,850,442).

As per slaims 3-4, 9-10 & 15-16

Leighton discloses creating digital secure encrypted document (titles) using "public-key cryptosystem" [C1 L1 to C2 L16; C3 L31 to C4 L14]. Leighton, Orrin or Mital does not explicitly disclose owner keeping the public part of the signature of the other person and making said public part available to potential subsequent buyers and comprising the step of sending the title, with the signature of the owner made using the public signature scheme of the owner, to said other person. However, Muftic discloses these steps [Abstract, Figures 17, 25-27; C1 L32 to

Art Unit: 3621

C8 L7; C7 L32-L63; C7 L1-L5; C18 L35-L67] to conduct secure electronic commercial transaction over the network, which uses public key cryptography. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures of Leighton, Mital, Orrin and Muftic to permit secure transaction to undertake world wide transparently over the Internet.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leighton, Mital and Orrin as applied to claims 5, 11, 17 above, and further in view of Arbaugh et al (US 6,185,678).

As per claim 6,

Leighton, Mital or Orrin does not explicitly disclose wherein the secure cryptographic generator is an IBM 4758. However, Arbaugh et al discloses this step to allow software and data to be transferred between computer system [C1 L20-67; C4 L33-L65; C7 L6-L27; C9 L11-60]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures of Leighton, Orrin, Mital and Arbaugh et al to permit secure transaction to undertake over the Internet.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.


Also in accordance with *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that Nathan J. Muller's Desktop Encyclopedia of the Internet, ("Desktop Encyclopedia") is additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Muller's Desktop Encyclopedia is a practical reference that clearly explains Internet services, applications, protocols, access methods, development tools, administration and management, standards, and regulations. Because of the reference's basic content (which is self-evident upon examination of the reference) and after further review of the entire record including the prior art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that the Desktop Encyclopedia is primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art. Because the reference is directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and understand the knowledge and information contained within the Desktop Encyclopedia.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

Art Unit: 3621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John Winter
Patent Examiner -- 3621

KAMBIZ ABDI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

